

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Advisory Action mailed May 6, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The Examiner issued a Final Action on February 2, 2005. Applicant submitted a Response to Examiner's Final Action on March 30, 2005. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on May 6, 2005 stating that the Response to Examiner's Final Action would not be entered because it raised new issues requiring further searching and consideration. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination of this Application so that the Response to Examiner's Final Action be entered and considered by the Examiner pursuant to this Request for Continued Examination. For the convenience of the Examiner, the amendments made to the claims in the Response to Examiner's Final Action and the accompanying comments are repeated herein.

Claims 14-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cajolet. Independent Claims 14 and 21 recite in general an ability to provide one or more samples of the rendered frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of the render job. By contrast, the Cajolet patent has no capability to provide the client with samples of rendered frames prior to completion of the render job as provided in the claimed invention. Support for the above recitation can be found at page 34, lines 1-7, of Applicant's specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 14-29 are not anticipated by the Cajolet patent.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cajolet in view of Smith, et al. Independent Claims 1 and 8 recite in general an ability to

provide one or more samples of the rendered frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of the render job. As stated above, the Cajole patent has no capability to provide the client with samples of rendered frames prior to completion of the render job as provided in the claimed invention. Moreover, the Smith, et al. patent is directed to document delivery and thus is not remotely associated with the technology of frame rendering provided in the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-13 are patentably distinct from the proposed Cajole - Smith, et al. combination.

The Examiner has failed to provide any indication that all of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of January 6, 2004 were considered during the examination of the present Application. More specifically, the Examiner did not provide the appropriate indication that the documents cited on the second Form PTO 1449 page were considered. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide an appropriate indication that all of the documents cited therein have been considered in the examination of the present Application.

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for submission of this Request for Continued Examination. Attached herewith is a Notification of Extension of Time with check in support thereof.

Attached herewith is a check in an amount of \$790.00 made payable to the "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks" to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e).

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants



Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

June 2, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6447

Customer Number: 05073